REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 35-37 were pending and stand rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address her comments below.

Claims 1, 4, and 21 have been amended herein. Claim 9 has been canceled. No claims have been added.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Travis, U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0215607, in view of Emens, U.S. Patent No. 6,745,178. Furthermore, claims 12-13 and 32-33 are rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Travis in view of Emens and further in view of Petropoulos, U.S. Patent Application No. 7,047,502.

In a second, alternative group of rejections, claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11, 15-22, 24, 26-31, and 35-37 are rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Travis in view of Denny, U.S. Patent Application No. 7,082,428, and claims 12-13 and 32-33 are further rejected over Travis in view of Denny and further in view of Petropoulos.

These rejections are traversed.

I. Emens Interpretation

Independent claim 1 recites a method comprising:

receiving a current search query;
providing a content display comprising a second article identifier;
comparing the current search query to a previous search query associated with the content display;
responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query differing by more than a predetermined amount:
executing the current search query to obtain a current search result, the current search result comprising a first article identifier;
displaying the current search result in the content display as the result of the current query; and
responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query not differing by more than the predetermined amount, displaying, in the content display as the results of the ***current*** query, **without executing the previous search query and without executing the current search query**, a ***previous*** search result associated with the previous search query.

Thus, the claimed invention recites "comparing the current search query to a previous search query associated with the content display." Responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query differing by more than a predetermined amount, the current search query is executed to obtain a current search result and the **current search result** is displayed in the content display as the result of the **current** query. Responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query not differing by more than the predetermined amount, a **previous** search result is displayed in the content display as the results of the **current** query, without executing the previous search query and without executing the current search query—thus, there is no need to evaluate queries, and the previous search result can be displayed without any such evaluation.

The first reference, Travis, discloses blending multiple sets of search results through transforming relevance scores of the results, but as the Examiner correctly notes, is silent regarding the "comparing" element, or the "updating" elements previously recited. Travis is likewise silent regarding the "displaying" element currently recited and discussed above. Thus, the Examiner is obliged to rely on Emens for these elements.

Emens does not disclose or suggest "responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query not differing by more than the predetermined amount, displaying, in the content display as the results of the ***current*** query, **without executing the previous search query and without executing the current search query**, a ***previous*** search result associated with the previous search query," as claimed. More specifically, Emens discloses a method in a computer network for identifying users with similar interests. (Emens, Abstract). Users enter query strings into a user interface such as that of Emens FIG. 4a, the query strings and query results being likewise displayed in the user interface as in FIG. 4b, and also stored in a memory associated with a collaborative search server. (*Id.*, 5:50-51, 5:33-34). If a user then chooses to share, or "publish" the query string and/or query results as in FIG. 4c, then for a given user, a similarity score is computed between that user's query (current query) and the published query (previous query). (*Id.*, 6:7-34). If the queries are sufficiently similar, then the queries and/or results are retrieved from the collaborative search server memory and displayed in the user interface of FIG. 4d. (*Id.*, 6:7-34). Note that this does not occur **without** evaluating the current and previous search queries and display the ***previous*** search result and as the results of the ***current*** query, as claimed, but rather **evaluates** the query by retrieving results from the collaborative search server to obtain a current search result and displays this current search result. Thus, one of skill in the art would not have considered the claimed invention obvious in view of Travis and Emens.

II. Denny Interpretation

As with the Emens interpretation, the Examiner correctly notes that Travis is silent regarding the "comparing" element, as well as the "updating" element previously recited. Thus,

the Examiner relies on Denny to show these elements.

Denny discloses collaborative searching, in which a database stores previously executed queries. (Denny, Abstract). If an entered query is substantially similar to a previously-executed query stored in the database, then an application server returns the results corresponding to the previously-executed query and determines whether the results are acceptable to the user; if no acceptable result is found, then the entered query must be executed on a remote information network in order to obtain query results. (*Id.*, Abstract). This technique increases query-processing speed by using local results for a query substantially similar to a previously-executed query, rather than being obliged to re-execute the query on a remote information network. (*Id.*, 2:51-67). Thus, Denny displays the stored results corresponding to the entered search query if there is a stored query that is sufficiently similar, and otherwise displays results obtained from executing the query on a remote information network. In either case, the search query is evaluated and the obtained results are displayed.

Thus, Denny, like Emens, does not disclose or suggest "responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query not differing by more than the predetermined amount, displaying, in the content display as the results of the ***current*** query, **without executing the previous search query and without executing the current search query**, a ***previous*** search result associated with the previous search query," as claimed. Rather, Denny evaluates the query in any case, returning either local or remote results depending on whether the query is sufficiently similar to a previous query. Thus, one of skill in the art would not have considered the claimed invention obvious in view of Travis and Denny.

Independent claim 21 recites:

...

responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query not differing by more than the predetermined amount:

displaying, in the content display as the results of the current query, without executing the previous search query and without executing the current search query, a previous search result associated with the previous search query.

Thus, claim 21 is distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from either independent claims 1 or 21, and thus are distinguishable from Travis, Emens, and Denny for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 21. Nor does Petropoulos remedy the deficiencies of Travis, Emens, and Denny. Petropoulus describes a way to display previews of information when a mouse cursor is over a particular region of a display, and is cited specifically as disclosing the use of a mouse pointer in updating a content display. Petropoulos fails to disclose the claimed "omitting" and "displaying" elements performed responsive at least in part to the current search query and the previous search query not differing by more than the predetermined amount, nor does the Examiner allege that it does so. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art considering the teachings of Travis, Emens, Denny, and Petropoulos, either alone or in combination, would not have found the claimed invention obvious.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

NINIANE WANG ET AL.

Date: January 5, 2009

By: /Christopher King/

Christopher P. King, Reg. No. 60,985
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7633
Fax: (650) 938-5200